

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE | | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/180,432 | 09/180.432 02/12/1999 | | FUMIKAZU MACHINO | 981361 | 6772 |
| 23850 | 7590 | 07/16/2002 | | | |
| | • | STERMAN & HA | EXAMINER | | |
| 1725 K STR SUITE 1000 | | <i>/</i> . | RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA | | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20006 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 1771 | 26 |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002 | 0 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| * | | | <u> </u> |
|---|--|--|----------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Advisory Action | 09/180,432 | MACHINO ET AL. | |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| • | Ula C Ruddock | 1771 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address | |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this application application of the same application of the | ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP | n |
| fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai | ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ng a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. | |
| NOTE: | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti | on(s): | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | reconsideration has been consi e Continuation Sheet. | idered but does NOT place the | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | · | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 15-43. | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| 8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on $___$ is | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp | roved by the Examiner. | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | and ma | |
| 10. Other: See Continuation Sheet | . (| ELIZABETH M. COLE PRIMARY EXAMINER | 0 |
| | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while Applicant's range is less than 2 microns, McCullough, Jr's fiber diameter generally range from 2-25 microns (col 4, In 25-27). A prima facie case of obviousness exists when the claimed ranges overlap ranges disclosed by the prior art or where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties.

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant must show that the particular range is critical, generally by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range. MPEP 2144.05